REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 6 and 9 contain allowable subject matter. The Office Action dated July 18, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-12 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are currently pending, of which claims 13-17 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 8, and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,284,543 to Kusano et al. (hereafter "*Kusano*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in M.P.E.P. § 2131, in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." *Kusano* does not teach every element of claims 1-5, 8, and 10-11, and thus, cannot anticipate these claims.

Amended claim 1 recites, "electrografting an organic film onto the conductive or semiconductive surface of the second object." The Specification provides that "the expression 'electrografting of an organic film onto a conductive or semiconductive surface' is understood to mean an operation that consists in bringing this surface into contact with at least one precursor of this organic film and in causing, by applying one or more semiconductive surface, this precursor to be attached via covalent bonds to said surface and, thereby, forming an organic film." *Specification*, page 8, lines 23-32, emphasis added. In other words, electrografting results in forming covalent bonds between the organic film and the conductive or semiconductive surface. *Kusano* fails to teach at least the above-recited feature of claim 1.

Kusano teaches plasma polymerization, which is different from the eletrografting recited in claim 1. *Kusano*, column 2, lines 47-53. Plasma polymerization is carried out in a treatment chamber which comprises two electrodes 3. *Kusano*, Fig. 1. Base material 5 is placed between the electrodes 3. *Id.* A monomer gas is introduced into the treatment chamber and a plasma area is formed between the two electrodes 3, which results in the polymerization of the monomer and

formation of a polymerized film on the surface of the base material 5. *Id.* Note, the polymerized film is deposited on the surface of the base material. There are covalent bonds formed between the polymerized film and the surface of the base material, as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over *Kusano*. Claims 2-5, 8, and 10-11, which variously depend from claim 1, are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Kusano* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,547,270 to Naarmann (hereafter "*Naarmann*"). The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Kusano* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,571 to Capote et al. (hereafter "*Capote*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As required in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *Kusano*, *Naarmann*, and *Capote* fail to teach or suggest, either singularly or in combination, every element of claims 7 and 12, and thus, cannot render these claims obvious.

As discussed above, *Kusano* fails to teach or suggest at least the above-recited element of claim 1, namely "electrografting an organic film onto the conductive or semiconductive surface of the second object." *Naarmann* and *Capote* do not cure the deficiency in *Kusano* with respect to claim 1. In fact, *Naarmann* is cited for teaching "electrochemical polymerization of pyrrole with phosphonium salts on an anode sheet," and *Naarmann* is cited for teaching "a semiconductor chip 100, which is coated with a liquid polymer resin 111, and a substrate 101 coated with a polymer flux 109 ... bonded together." *Office Action*, paragraphs 13 and 15. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of *Kusano*, *Naarmann*, and *Capote*. Claims 7 and 17, which directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant